



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virgnia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,069		11/03/2003	William Gabriel Pagan	RPS9-2003-0146US1	3724
45219	7590	06/29/2006		EXAMINER	
KUNZLER	& ASSO	CIATES	NELSON, ALECIA DIANE		
8 EAST BRO	OADWAY	ľ			
SUITE 600				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SALT LAKI	E CITY, 1	UT 84111		2629	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/700,069	PAGAN, WILLIAM GABRIEL	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alecia D. Nelson	2629	
- The MAILING DATE of this communication of Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a residual to the community of	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. IANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on OS This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ T Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matt	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 5) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and application Papers.	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyang rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a 	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/3/03.		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/700,069 Page 2

Art Unit: 2629

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/03/03 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 27 recites a computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable program code for providing improved interaction to a user of a pointing device, however the specification describes the computer readable program code as being at least partially as electronic signals on a system or network (see paragraph 28). Claims 28-30 are rejected for being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/700,069 Page 3

Art Unit: 2629

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10-13, 18, 22, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,476).

With reference to claims 1, 6, 10, 18, 24, 25, and 27, Bradski et al. teaches an apparatus for providing improved interaction to a user of a pointing device, the apparatus comprising: a pointing device interface module (104) configured to interface with a pointing device (see column 3, lines 10-18); an event buffer (108) configured to receive pointing device events generated by a user (see column 3, lines 53-59); directing pointing device events from the buffer to a receiving process (see column 3, lines 9-30); and a feedback module configured to provide visual feedback to the user regarding buffered pointing device events (see column 4, lines 12-20). With further reference to claim 25, Bradiski et al. teaches a pointing device (314); a CPU (102) configured to execute at least one process; and a monitor (312) configured to display interface elements corresponding to at least one process (see column 5, lines 22-55).

With reference to **claims 2, 11, and 28**, Bradski et al. teaches that the feedback module is further configured to provide feedback to the user regarding pointing device events passed to a receiving process (see column 3, line 53-column 4, line 20).

With reference to **claims 3, 4, 12, and 13**, Bradski et al. teaches that the receiving process is an application process running on an operating system (see column 3, lines 9-30).

Art Unit: 2629

With reference to **claims 9, 22, and 26**, Bradski et al. teaches that the pointing device is selected from the group consisting of a mouse, a pen, a digitizing tablet, a trackball, a touch pad, a touch screen, a pointing stick, a data glove, and a gesture recognizer (see column 1, lines 39-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 5, 7, 8, 17, 19-21, 23, and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski et al. as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10-13, 18, 22, and 24-28 as explained above and further in view of Bates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,664,990)

While teaching all that is required as explained above including the teaching of providing visual feedback to the user (see column 4, lines 12-20), there fails to be any disclosure of the audible feedback or tactile feedback.

Bates et al. teaches the a computer system having a graphical user interface object wherein the system is capable of providing audible, visual, as well as tactile feedback to the user (see column 5, lines 64-67); wherein the visual feedback being in the form of a status bar or modified cursor (see abstract; column 3, lines 39-41), or a cursor color or shape options (see column 8, lines 54-67). While not specifically

Art Unit: 2629

teaching that the tactile feedback is selected from the group consisting of force, pressure, vibration, surface actuation, and motion, the examiner takes Official Notice in that all of the claimed tactile feedback forms are well known to those skilled in the art and would be obvious for usage in a device providing tactile feedback to the user.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the user to receive audible and tactile feedback similar to that which is taught by Bates et al. to be used in a system similar to that which is taught by Bradski et al. in order to generate a system capable registering user input and provide user feedback in order to thereby provide a system that allows for more accurate user input.

8. Claims 14-16 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradski et al. as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10-13, 18, 22, and 24-28 as explained above and further in view of Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,396,600).

With reference to the claims, Bradski et al. teaches all that is required as explained above, however fails to teach inventorying the pointing device events.

Further, while Bradski et al. teaches providing the user with feedback as explained above, there fails to be any disclosure of the feedback comprising communicating a buffered event quantity or a buffered event type.

Thompson et al. teaches an apparatus and method for interfacing comprising inventorying the pointing device events (see column 3, lines 1-26). Thompson et al.

Also teaches a number of routines that allows generating a buffered event quantity and buffered event type for the inventories (see column 5, line 43-column 7, line 54).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the inventorying of the pointing device events including inventory data representing event quantity and event type, as taught by Thompson et al., to be carried out in a system similar to that which is taught by Bradski et al. allowing for feedback to the user during control of the input device in order to thereby provide to the user an interface between a computer system and a human user which allows for more accurate input.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alecia D. Nelson whose telephone number is 571-272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/700,069

Art Unit: 2629

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

adn/ADN June 20, 2006

KENT CHANG PRIMARY EXAMINER

Kentles

Page 7